RE: 35th Ave TCRA questions

Langmann, Danielle (ATSDR/DCHI/CB) <dzl4@cdc.gov>

Thu 1/29/2015 12:50 PM

To: Jardine, Rick <Jardine.Richard@epa.gov>;

Cc: Casteel, Sue <Casteel.Sue@epa.gov>; Anderson, Barbara A. (ATSDR/DCHI/SSB) <bha6@cdc.gov>; Patel, Subash <Patel.Subash@epa.gov>; Adams, Glenn <Adams.Glenn@epa.gov>; RHenderson@otie.com <RHenderson@otie.com>; john everett <cmcs1018@aol.com>; Newman, Keriema <Newman.Keriema@epa.gov>;

Thanks Rick, we appreciate your responses.

From: Jardine, Rick [mailto:Jardine.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 12:20 PM
To: Langmann, Danielle (ATSDR/DCHI/CB)
Cc: Sue Casteel (CDC epa.gov); Anderson, Barbara A. (ATSDR/DCHI/SSB); Patel, Subash; Adams, Glenn; RHenderson@otie.com; john everett; Newman, Keriema
Subject: Re: 35th Ave TCRA questions

Danielle,
I'm discussing these questions with my consultants and contractor and consultant. I'm also copying all on this response in case I get something wrong.

The clean soil samples are few, the borrow area is not impacted by any known operations. That soil should routinely test consistently at background levels.

We have no bioavailability info for this Site.

The list of parcels and respective sample locations are being reviewed by OTIE. They expect to complete review and provide an answer next week. It is likely that some properties have many grids due to size (the public housing proprty), but some may be due to the depth sampling (1 composite every 6 inches of depth).

The maps will take a few weeks to organize for distribution as the lead GIS personnel are key to Site work as we wind down Phase 2 and develop Phase 3.

If you seek clarification or immediate information let's schedule a teleconference.
Thanks.
Rick

Sent from my iPhoneo

On Jan 28, 2015, at 09:50, Langmann, Danielle (ATSDR/DCHI/CB) <dzl4@cdc.gov> wrote:

> Rick,

Thanks for providing information on the RALs for the different phases. And I appreciate your willingness to find the averages for the clean soil fill.

As you pull those average clean-fill levels, I do have some more questions. If I should field these questions to someone else, please let me know.

1. Do you have any site-specific bioavailability data that you could share with us?

2. The scribe database shows properties listed as residential that have many quadrants. Are some of these large vacant lots the city took over? It seems strange to us to have properties with so many quadrants when most have 1-3 quadrants. We are just wondering what the story is with them, especially the top 10. Here is a list of the top 20 from the database:

	propertyID	ptype	nquads
1	FM-0161	Residential	127
2	CV-0511	Residential	76
3	CV-0971	Residential	71
4	CV-0748	Residential	68
5	CV-0509	Commercial	54
6	FM-0165	Residential	41
7	CV-1360	Residential	33
8	CV-0005	Residential	30
9	CV-1363	Residential	25
10	HP-0320	Residential	20
11	CV-0613	Residential	13
12	FM-0160	Residential	12
13	FM-0284	Church	9
14	CV-0978	Commercial	8
15	CV-0008	Residential	7
16	CV-0013	Commercial	6
17	CV-0256	Residential	6
18	CV-0405	Commercial	6
19	CV-0822	Church	6
20	FM-0308	Residential	6

3. For the maps, do you (or someone in GIS) have shape files you could share? Like for the site boundary lines, neighborhood boundary lines, property boundary lines for removals for each phase, etc? We can likely create them on our own, but thought it might be easier to get them from EPA if they are readily available.

Thanks in advance for any information you can provide. No rush either, we know you are out in the field and appreciate any support you can provide.

Thanks again,
Danielle

From: Jardine, Rick [mailto:Jardine.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2015 2:43 PM
To: Langmann, Danielle (ATSDR/DCHI/CB)
Cc: Sue Casteel (CDC epa.gov); Anderson, Barbara A. (ATSDR/DCHI/SSB); Patel, Subash; Adams, Glenn; RHenderson@otie.com; john everett; Newman, Keriema
Subject: Re: 35th Ave TCRA questions

Danielle,
It was my pleasure meeting with you on Site. I've copied the other players on our Team to help provide the correct information in response to your inquiry.

Phase I - RAL number was 15.0 ppm for Benzo(a)pyrene or TEQ: 390 ppm for arsenic (although we could have gone 10 x 61 - it was never that close), and 1200 ppm for lead.

Phase 2 - RAL 1.5 BaP or TEQ, 61 arsenic, 400 lead PLUS children present

Phase 3 - RAL 3.0 BaP or TEQ (accept round-off if high 2.8 or 2.9), 120 for arsenic (no RAL for lead, only removed incidental to cocktail contamination).

As for the fill soil, I'll have to get those numbers to you next week once I return to the Site. As I remember, the semi-voas are BDL. We do have lead and arsenic at background concentrations. Please send me a reminder if I don't get that info to you by mid-week.
Thanks,
Rick

From: Langmann, Danielle (ATSDR/DCHI/CB) <dzl4@cdc.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2015 11:54 AM
To: Jardine, Rick
Cc: Casteel, Sue; Anderson, Barbara A. (ATSDR/DCHI/SSB)
Subject: 35th Ave TCRA questions

Hi Rick,

I hope all is well. Thanks so much for meeting with me last week. It was a big help hearing what was done for the TCRAs and seeing the site. I am really grateful for the time you took out of your day for me!

I do have some questions about numbers that I can't seem to find in the information posted online. Could you help me clarify/verify I have the right numbers?

The RALs for the TCRA are questionable because the documentation only lists the RALs in general terms like that they are "three or ten times the RML". Can you help verify whether my numbers and understanding of the values are correct?

1. Can you verify the RAL (Phase I and II, which are completed) of 15 ppm was used for BaP, which is 10x the child carcinogenic SL of 1.5 ppm from the RML table. You also mentioned that at some

point your decision criteria changed from using BaP levels to BaP TE levels to make the determinations for removals. When was this change made (for Phase II maybe)? Also, for the BaP TE calculations, what number do you use for chrysene? ATSDR (and EPA I thought) uses 0.001 now. However, Barbara (who is working on the site with me) said the scribe database has chrysene as 0.01. If I should check with Limari instead regarding the chrysene number, just let me know.

2. I know the RAL for arsenic was picked to be 10x some value, but it is unclear what that value was.... a call I had with others in EPA back in Dec 2014 mentioned 370 ppm. The US EPA website with the RMLs lists the arsenic noncarcinogenic child ingestion SL as 39 ppm and the arsenic child noncarcinogenic SL as 34 ppm. That would make the RAL 340 ppm, 370 ppm, or 390 ppm for your Phase I and II removals. Can you let me know which value is correct?

3. Can you confirm the RAL of 1,200 ppm was used for lead during Phase I and II, which is 3x the recommended value of 400 ppm.

4. During our talk, you mentioned US EPA decided to do another Phase of TCRA (Phase III) that includes removal actions at 2x the BaP TE (so I think that means 3 ppm and above) and 2x for arsenic.... but you mentioned the arsenic value changed so I am not sure what the RAL would be now. Can you let me know what the RML and RAL values are for Phase III?

5. On a different note, can you provide the average value for lead, arsenic and BaP TE for the clean fill soil you are putting into the yards where removals occur? Or is there a document I can pull these three values from?

Any assistance you can provide would be greatly appreciated,
Danielle